

debt and is a “consumer” as that term is defined by 15 U.S.C. 1692a(3).

6. Pursuant to the definitions outlined in 15 U.S.C. 1692a(1-6), Defendant is a debt collector and sought to collect a consumer debt from Plaintiff which was allegedly due and owing from Plaintiff, and Plaintiff is a consumer debtor.
7. Defendant is debt collection company located in Houston, Texas.
8. Defendant uses instrumentalities of interstate commerce or the mails in any business the principal purpose of which is the collection of any debts, or who regularly collects or attempts to collect, directly or indirectly, debts owed or due or asserted to be owed or due another and is a "debt collector" as that term is defined by 15 U.S.C. § 1692a(6).
9. Defendant acted through its agents, employees, officers, members, directors, heirs, successors, assigns, principals, trustees, sureties, subrogees, representatives, and insurers.

FACTUAL ALLEGATIONS

10. Defendant places collection telephone calls to Plaintiff in an attempt to collect an alleged debt.
11. Plaintiff’s alleged debt arises from transactions for personal, household, and/or family purposes.
12. Defendant places collection calls to Plaintiff at 319-367-26XX.
13. In or around June of 2015, Defendant placed a collection call to Plaintiff and left a voicemail message.
14. In the voicemail message, Defendant’s representative failed to disclose the name of the company placing the call, failed to state that the call was being placed by a debt collector, and failed to state that the call was being placed to collect an alleged debt. *See* Transcribed Voicemail Message attached hereto as Exhibit “A.”

15. In the voicemail message, Defendant's representative directed Plaintiff to return the call to 866-391-0768 extension 5092, which is a number that belongs to Defendant. *See* Exhibit "A."
16. Defendant placed a second collection call to Plaintiff and left an identical voicemail message. *See* Exhibit "A."
17. Defendant is using false, deceptive and misleading means in connection with attempting to collect a debt by not identifying the purpose of its phone calls or that they are an attempt to collect a debt.

COUNT I
DEFENDANT VIOLATED THE FAIR DEBT COLLECTION PRACTICES ACT

18. Defendant violated the FDCPA based on the following:
 - a. Defendant violated § 1692d(6) of the FDCPA by placing collection calls to Plaintiff without meaningful disclosure of the caller's identity.
 - b. Defendant violated § 1692e of the FDCPA by using false, deceptive or misleading representations or means in connection with the collection of the debt;
 - c. Defendant violated § 1692e(11) of the FDCPA by failing to disclose in its communications with Plaintiff that the communication was from a debt collector.

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff, JENS LEE, respectfully requests judgment be entered against Defendant, GC SERVICES, LP, for the following:

19. Statutory damages pursuant to the Fair Debt Collection Practices Act, 15 U.S.C. 1692k.
20. Costs and reasonable attorneys' fees pursuant to the Fair Debt Collection Practices Act, 15 U.S.C. 1692k
21. Any other relief that this Honorable Court deems appropriate.

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED,

By: /s/ J.D. Haas
J.D. Haas, Esq.
9801 Dupont Ave S #430
Minneapolis, MN 55431
jdhaas@jdhaas.com
Direct Dial: (952) 345-102
Attorney for Plaintiff

DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL

PLEASE TAKE NOTICE that Plaintiff, JENS LEE, demands a jury trial in this case.